

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN**

MARY LOU PETT, KATHLEEN FICK-  
GEE, DIANE BRYCE, PATTI  
DELVALLE, MICHELLE HOLCOMB,  
KIM READUS, ALICE REESE, ERIKA  
VAN ALLER, and LINDA WHITE,  
individually and on behalf of all others  
similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

PUBLISHERS CLEARING HOUSE, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 2:22-cv-11389-DPH-EAS

Hon. Denise Page Hood  
Mag. Elizabeth A. Stafford

**PLAINTIFFS' NOTICE OF SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITY**

Plaintiffs, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, submit this notice of supplemental authority to apprise the Court of a recent decision relevant to the issues raised in Plaintiffs' response in opposition (ECF No. 27) to Defendant's motion to dismiss (ECF No. 25):

1. On May 19, 2023, the Honorable Bernard A. Friedman issued a decision denying the defendant's motion to dismiss in *Nock v. Boardroom, Inc. d/b/a Bottom Line, Inc.*, Case No. 2:22-cv-11296-BAF-EAS, ECF No. 27 (E.D. Mich. May 19, 2023), a PPPA action similar to the instant matter. A copy of the *Nock* decision is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

2. In *Nock*, the court held that "Article III standing poses no obstacle to [Plaintiff's] PPPA claim" in light of the Sixth Circuit's controlling decision in *Coulter-Owens v. Time Inc.*, 695 F. App'x 117 (6th Cir. 2017) and the "district courts in this circuit [that] have consistently followed *Coulter-Owens*["] See *Nock*, at 7 (collecting cases).

3. The court in *Nock* also held that the six-year limitation period found in M.C.L. § 600.5813 applied to plaintiff's PPPA claim. See *id.*, at 8 (noting that "countless opinions" from Michigan's federal courts have "yielded the same outcome – that the PPPA's limitation period is six years").

4. Finally, the court found that the complaint's allegations – which are less detailed than the allegations of the operative complaint in this case – "are more than

adequate to show that [the defendant] plausibly violated the PPPA[.]” *Id.*, at 9. The court rejected the defendant’s argument, also made by Defendant in this case, that “the screenshot of NextMark’s website is not particularized enough to support [plaintiff]’s allegations,” finding that “[t]his argument misconceives how pleadings are evaluated on a Rule 12(b)(6).” *Id.*, at 10 (explaining that “no ‘evidentiary support’ – whether ‘in an affidavit or any other form’ – is necessary ‘for a claim to be plausible’”) (quoting *Gallivan v. United States*, 943 F.3d 291, 293 (6th Cir. 2019)). Thus, the court found the decision in *Nashel v. N.Y Times Co.*, No. 22-10633, 2022 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 185552 (E.D. Mich. Oct. 11, 2022) – which Defendant relies heavily upon in its motion to dismiss here – “unpersuasive” for the same reason. *See id.*, at 11 (citing *Gaines v. Nat’l Wildlife Fed’n*, No. 22-11173, 2023 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 75317, at \*20-23 (E.D. Mich. May 1, 2023)). Accordingly, the court denied the defendant’s motion to dismiss in its entirety. *See id.* (“Because [plaintiff] states a plausible claim for relief under the PPPA – even without the embedded NextMark screenshot – her allegations are alone sufficient to withstand Rule 12(b)(6) scrutiny.”).

Dated: May 22, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ E. Powell Miller

E. Powell Miller (P39487)

THE MILLER LAW FIRM, P.C.

950 W. University Drive, Suite 300

Rochester, MI 48307

Tel: 248-841-2200  
epm@millerlawpc.com

Joseph I. Marchese  
Philip L. Fraietta (P85228)  
BURSOR & FISHER, P.A.  
888 Seventh Avenue  
New York, New York 10019  
Tel: 646.837.7150  
Fax: 212.989.9163  
jmarshese@bursor.com  
pfraietta@bursor.com

Frank S. Hedin  
David W. Hall  
HEDIN HALL LLP  
1395 Brickell Avenue, Suite 1140  
Miami, Florida 33131  
Tel: 305.357.2107  
Fax: 305.200.8801  
fhedin@hedinhall.com  
dhall@hedinhall.com

*Counsel for Plaintiffs and the Putative Class*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on May 22, 2023, I electronically filed the foregoing documents using the Court's electronic filing system, which will notify all counsel of record authorized to receive such filings.

/s/ E. Powell Miller

E. Powell Miller (P39487)

**THE MILLER LAW FIRM, P.C.**

950 W. University Dr., Ste. 300

Rochester, MI 48307

Tel: (248) 841-2200

epm@millerlawpc.com